



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,056	07/31/2003	Michael S. Pazar	568/259	3596

7590 03/02/2005

Vincent J. Gnoffo
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

HORTON, YVONNE MICHELE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/633,056

Applicant(s)

PAZAR, MICHAEL S.

Examiner

Yvonne M. Horton

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 87-100 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 87-100 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of claim 14 is withdrawn in view of a more detailed review of the reference(s) to MARTIN. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1,2,4-6,13 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent #2,075,859 to MARTIN. MARTIN discloses the use of a record keeping apparatus (8) embedded in a material, lines 40-41; having a means (9) for maintaining a fixed position within the embedded material, column 1, line 57 to column 2, line 4; and including at least one archival media containing information concealed therein, lines 18-23. In reference to claim 2, the material is cement also commonly known as concrete. Regarding claims 4-6, the receptacle (8) includes at least one cap (11) being formed from a non-corrosive metal, line 24, or plastic material, lines 44-48, and having threads (TR) as a means for releasably sealing the cap (11), see the marked attachment. In reference to claim 13, the receptacle (8) further includes a groove (G) that aids in maintaining the receptacle (8) within the material. Regarding claim 16, the receptacle (8) is cylindrical.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #2,075,859 to MARTIN. MARTIN discloses the basic claimed apparatus except for media information explicitly including a burial location. The receptacle (8) of MARTIN includes information about the deceased, lines 18-23; however MARTIN is not explicit as to what information is provided. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the receptacle with whatever information so desired. The situation and the person being buried would dictate the information needed for display or needed to be provided therein.

Claims 7-9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #2,075,859 to MARTIN in view of US Patent #4,697,316 to SEMON. MARTIN discloses the basic claimed receptacle except for the use of seal or O-ring. SEMON teaches that it is known in the art to provide a receptacle with a seal (74) in the form of an O-ring between the receptacle (26,28) and the cap (30). Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the receptacle of MARTIN with the O-ring seal of SEMON in order to provide a tight and secure grip between the cap and receptacle thereby preventing water or any other fluids from entering the receptacle and damaging its contents. Regarding claim 9, neither MARTIN nor SEMON discloses the use of a groove to receive the O-ring. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the receptacle with groove in order

Art Unit: 3635

to ensure that the O-ring doesn't slip thereby ensuring an even further tight fit between the cap and receptacle.

Claims 10-12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent #2,075,859 to MARTIN in view of US Patent #6,463,703 to MATTIS.

MARTIN discloses the basic claimed receptacle except for the use of a sealing means and adhesive. MATTIS teaches that it is known in the art to provide a receptacle (18) with a sealing means (52,56,58) between the receptacle (18) and the cap (50); wherein the sealing means is an adhesive (56). Regarding claim 12, MATTIS does not explicitly detail that his adhesive is an epoxy resin; however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the use intended as an obvious matter of design choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 87-100 are allowed.


Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In view of a more detailed review of MARTIN, the applicant's arguments are considered moot because the large or widened head (9) of MARTIN is clearly disclosed as a means of maintaining the receptacle (8) in a fixed position within the material, column 1, line 57 to column 2, line 4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yvonne M. Horton whose telephone number is (703) 308-1909. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 am - 3:00 pm.

Art Unit: 3635

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl D. Friedman can be reached on (703) 308-0839. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Yvonne M. Horton
Art Unit 3635
2/24/05